



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,551	01/26/2001	Brian L. Arend	1801/USW0596PUS	6404
22193	7590	12/17/2007	EXAMINER	
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC LAW DEPT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP 1801 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3800 DENVER, CO 80202			MEHRPOUR, NAGHMEH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/770,551	ARENDE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Naghmeh Mehrpour	2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11, 13-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless
e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

1. **Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harries et al. (US Patent Number 6,222,458 B1).

Regarding claim 1, Harris teaches a method for inhibiting wireless telecommunication within a limited region (protected area, col 3 lines 21-24) of the telecommunication coverage (1-6 miles),(see figure 1, col 2 lines 20-30) comprising generating a noise signal (alarm or white/pink noise) within a frequency range (cellular phone frequency of interest), (col 3 lines 45-53) the wireless telecommunications device (cellular phone in the vehicle) broadcasting the noise signal (white noise) into the region 200 (see figure 2, col 3 lines 3-12).

Regarding claims 4,15, Harris teaches a method/system wherein the wireless telecommunications is through spread spectrum(CDMA), the noise signal generated

substantially across the spread spectrum (CDMA) (col 1 lines 45-54). The CDMA is known as the principle of the spread spectrum communications properties.

Regarding claims 7, 9, 17, 19, Harris inherently teaches a method/system for inhibiting wireless telecommunications (col 3 lines 20-24), the region is the inside of an automatic vehicle (col 3 lines 11-5). When the vehicle enters the gas station area, the cellular phone therefore is disabled inside of the vehicle region which is now within the gas station area.

Regarding claims 11, 21, Harris teaches a method/system for inhibiting wireless telecommunications (col 2 lines 51-53) comprising: controlling broadcasting the noise signal based on detecting at least one condition (presence of RF emission, when vehicle entering the gas station) of the automotive vehicle (col 3 lines 3 lines 5-11, lines 20-24).

Regarding claim 13, Harris teaches a system for inhibiting wireless telecommunications within a limited region of the telecommunications coverage (1-6 miles) (see figure 1) comprising: a radio frequency noise generator 226 (col 3 line 51), generating a noise signal (white/pink noise, col 3 line 50) covering at least one frequency range (see figure 1, RF frequencies) of the wireless telecommunication; at least one antenna 228 generates noise (col 3 lines 50-53), and the antenna 228 broadcasting the noise signal into the region 200 (see figure 2, col 3 lines 50-53);

and control logic 105 operative to initiate or suspend broadcasting of the noise signal (alarm) based on at least one control input (gas station area) (see figure 2, col 3 lines 45-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identify disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 8, 18,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. (US Patent Number 6,222,458 B1).

Regarding claims 8, 18, Harris teaches a method/system for inhibiting wireless telecommunications (col 2 lines 51-53). Harris fails to teach that the region is inside of an aircraft. However the Examiner takes official notice that a mobile phone which broadcasting noise signals inside of an aircraft is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching with Harris, in order to warn the user that the cellular phone does not operate in prohibited areas such as the inside of an aircraft in flight.

3. **Claims 2, 14,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. (US Patent Number 6,222,458 B1) in view of Richardson (US Patent Number 4,498,193).

Regarding claims 2, 14, Harris teaches a method/system for inhibiting wireless telecommunications comprising:

a jammer which is driven by white or pink noise from noise generator 226. RF transmitter 228 transmits white or pink noise across the entire frequency band over which cellular phone transmit and receive (col 3 lines 45-53). White noise is spread in the wideband spectrum. Harris does not specifically mention a band pass filter accepting the wideband noise signal and producing the noise signal within the frequency range of the wireless telecommunication. However Richardson teaches a noise generate 1 which is arranged to produce a signal at 25 kHz (wideband) (see figure 1, col 2 lines 52-68, col 3 lines 3-5), and a bandpass filter 4, that accepts the wideband noise signal and produces the noise signal within the frequency range of the wireless telecommunication (col 1 lines 45-61, col 2 lines 3-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Richardson with Harris, in order to provide a front end receiver for a wideband communication signal which is easy to implement and over comes signal gain.

4. **Claims 3, 5-6, 16,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. (US Patent Number 6,222,458 B1) in view of GEYRA (International Publication WO 98/34412).

Regarding claim 3, Harris teaches a method for inhibiting wireless telecommunication system comprising: broadcasting a noise signal (col 2 lines 19-20). Harris fails to teach that the telecommunication system broadcasts noise via at least one directional antenna to inhibit communication within a limited region. However GEYRA teaches a telecommunication system for inhibiting wireless communication that includes broadcasting noise via at least one directional antenna to inhibit communication within a limited region (page 3 line 13-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of GEYRA with Harris's teaching, in order to provide disabling a wireless cellular phone that is restricted to a specific confined area.

Regarding claim 5, Harris fails to teach a method/system wherein controlling broadcasting a noise signal based on a public event. However GEYRA teaches a communication method/system wherein controlling the broadcasting of a noise signal is based on a public event (col 3 lines 13-18).Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of GEYRA with Harris's teaching, in order to restrict for the operation of the cellular phone within public areas.

Regarding Claims 6, 16, Harris fails to teach a method wherein broadcasting of a noise signal is automatically based on at least one condition of the public event. However GEYRA teaches a method wherein broadcasting of a signal is automatically (page 1 lines 17-21, page 3 lines 14-19) based on at least one condition of a public event (page 6 lines 5-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of GEYRA with Harris's teaching, in order to warn the user that the cellular phone does not operate in prohibited areas, such as public gatherings.

5. **Claims 10, 20,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. (US Patent Number 6222,458) in view of Kushita (US Patent Number 6,570,689).

Regarding claims 10, 20, Harris teaches a method/system that broadcasting a noise signal within a frequency range with in a region (col 3 lines 5-11). Harris fails to teach a method/system that broadcasting a noise signal based on detecting the presence of a telephone in a cradle. However Kushita teaches a method/system wherein when attachment of the portable telephone to the cradle is detected the drive mode is cancelled, or while the automobile is traveling, hand-free speech communication can be inhibited (col 9 lines 10-25). Since Harries teaches a method of generating noise while disabling the cellular phone in a predefined area, and Kushita teaches a method

of disabling the telephone when detection is resulted in the presence of the telephone on a cradle. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Kushita with Harris's teaching, in order to provide a system that can deter theft of radio telephones mounted within vehicle cradles.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/07/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that "*Harris does not broadcast the plurality of noise signals from different locations. , and does not disclose that telecommunication is inhibited in the overlap of the broadcasted noise signals.*"

Examiner asserts that Harris teaches protection against use of a two way radio, e.g. a cellular phone, at a combustible delivery station. One mode is active, and detects operating cell phones at the gas station. The phones can be detected using Bluetooth. The pump can be turned off when the alarm is detected. Another mode is passive. This mode can be via shielding, alone or with RF jamming. Harris does not specifically mention a band pass filter accepting the wideband noise signal and producing the noise signal within the frequency range of the wireless telecommunication. However Richardson teaches a noise generate 1 which is arranged to produce a signal at 25 kHz (wideband) (see figure 1, col 2 lines 52-68, col

3 lines 3-5), and a bandpass filter 4, that accepts the wideband noise signal and produces the noise signal within the frequency range of the wireless telecommunication (col 1 lines 45-61, col 2 lines 3-6). Therefore, by combining the above teaching of Richardson with Harris, providing a front end receiver for a wideband communication signal which is easy to implement and over comes signal gain.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. **Any responses to this action should be mailed to:**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naghmeh Mehrpour whose telephone number is 571-272-7913. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00- 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold be reached (571) 272-7905.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NM

December 11, 2007

MACHMEH MEHRPOUR
PRIMARY EXAMINER